

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/249,543 | EVANS ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |

William W. Moore

1652

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) William W. Moore, Examiner

(3) Dr. Harriett Striegel, Applicant's counsel

(2) Ponnathuppan Achuthamurthy, Supervisor Primary Examiner

(4) Dr. Thomas Evans, Inventor

Date of Interview: 15 August 2003

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: Newly proposed claims 63-93

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Several amendments clarifying terms in the proposed new claims 63-93 were discussed that may place the method claims
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

*in condition for allowance upon submission
of said claims 63-93.*

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

William W. Moore Jr.
Examiner's signature, if required



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO. |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|

EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

11

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Gregory Williams, Applicant's Counsel (3) Dr. Francisco Pastor, Applicant's Representative
(2) Dr. Marriet M. Strimpel, Applicant's Counsel (4) Ponnathapura Achutanand, Primary Examiner
Date of interview 20 June 2002 (5) William W. Moon Examiner

Type: Telephonic Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No. If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. was not reached.

Claims discussed: Claim 1 and 2 as originally filed and in revised draft

Identification of prior art discussed: Mills et al., Tamm et al., (unpublished) and Kent et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: It was agreed that the term "expressed protein" in the revised preamble of claim 1 combined with the term "having a C-terminal Prostase" in clause (a) of the claim, together with revision of clause (c) to indicate "combining" the first and second target proteins to permit ligation distinguishes all claims over the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

William W. Moon
Examiner's Signature